

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 15-21 are pending. Claims 1, 15 and 20 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendment can be found at least in Figure 1 of the instant application.

102 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Hayashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0141538). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hayashi.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi does not show or suggest "a bit line region enclosed within and surrounded by said silicon substrate" as recited in independent Claim 1. Looking at Figure 2 of Hayashi, for example, the buried bit line 7 is not surrounded by the substrate 1. Instead, the buried bit line 7 of Hayashi is bordered by groove 11 and insulating film 12. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no definition of the word "surrounding" which permits Hayashi to be interpreted as reading on Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi does not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 1, and that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 3-5 and 7 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. As such, Applicants also respectfully submit

that Hayashi does not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-5 and 7 dependent on Claim 1, and that Claims 3-5 and 7 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is traversed.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 6 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Wen et al. ("Wen;" U.S. Patent No 6,143,610), Rodgers (U.S. Patent No. 6,060,739) and Saitoh (U.S. Patent No. 6,060,739). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 6 and 15-21 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hayashi, Wen, Rodgers and Saitoh, alone or in combination.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is dependent on Claim 1. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi does not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. Applicants further submit that Wen, Rodgers and Saitoh do not overcome the shortcomings of Hayashi. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi, Wen, Rodgers and Saitoh, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest "a bit line region enclosed within and surrounded by said silicon substrate" as recited in independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants also respectfully submit that Hayashi, Wen, Rodgers and Saitoh, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the

present invention as recited in Claim 6 dependent on Claim 1, and that Claim 6 is also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 15-21

Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi does not show or suggest “a silicon substrate; ... and a plurality of bit lines, ... each bit line buried within and surrounded by said substrate” as recited in independent Claim 15 (emphasis added). Applicants further submit that Wen, Rodgers and Saitoh do not overcome the shortcomings of Hayashi. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Hayashi, Wen, Rodgers and Saitoh, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest “a silicon substrate; ... and a plurality of bit lines, ... each bit line buried within and surrounded by said substrate” as recited in independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants also respectfully submit that Hayashi, Wen, Rodgers and Saitoh, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 16-21 dependent on Claim 15, and that Claims 16-21 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions


In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-7 and 15-21 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date: 10/24/05

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060